

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,288	08/23/2001	Gerald A. Pierson	18554F	1186
35979	7590 02/21/2006		EXAM	INER
BRACEWELL & GIULIANI LLP P.O. BOX 61389			VARGOT, M	IATHIEU D
	TX 77208-1389		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1732	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/938,288	PIERSON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are provided by the office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. poly be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06	February 2006.	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ TI	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	·	•
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		-
4) Claim(s) 42 and 43 is/are pending in the app	olication.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>42 and 43</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	ccepted or b) objected to t	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
 Certified copies of the priority docume 	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		
 Copies of the certified copies of the pr 	· ·	received in this National Stage
application from the International Bure	` ' ' '	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified copies not t	received.
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)
2))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

1.Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 42, the last two lines, the recitation "between each of the pairs of...outer peripheries" does not seem to make sense and it would appear that additional language is required.

- 2.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al –296 (see Fig. 1 and the die-cutting step--the penultimate box--of Fig. 27).

Smith et al discloses the basic claimed process of molding a an optical compact disk by molding a storage medium (10) in the form of a trading card, the medium having a pattern of digital data encoded on a surface of a data carrier (16), such surface having a major elevational portion which holds the data, this portion being bounded by first and second pairs of spaced-apart outer side peripheries which extend past the outer portions of the disk—ie, the perimeters of the trading card. The perimeter of the data carrier itself constitutes a circle, so technically it would not have any spaced-apart peripheries. Hence, Smith et al fails to teach that spaced apart outer side peripheries define outer boundaries of "at least portions of the disk" and that such include a first pair

Application/Control Number: 09/938,288

Art Unit: 1732

of spaced-apart peripheries which extend arcuately. It is submitted that these aspects would have been within the skill level of the art. For instance, Figure 1 of Smith et al shows that the edge of the circular data carrier 16 is very close to the long dimension of the rectangular trading card. It certainly would have been obvious, in view of the die cutting step shown in Figure 27, to fashion the data carrier 16 so that it would include straight sections which coincide with the long dimension of the playing card—this would increase the amount of data that would be incorporated onto the data carrier. In so doing, one would generate a data carrier that would have the instant spaced-apart outer side peripheries, with one set extending linearly and the other set extending arcuately therebetween. Given the dimensions of the playing card (see col. 6, line 18), instant claim 43 is met in Smith et al.

Page 3

3.Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's comments directed to Rohde et al have been noted but are now moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Applicant also needs to look at the last two lines of claim 42, the recitation starting with "between each...", which does not make sense when read in continuity with the language starting at line 5 of the claim, "each of the first pair of...".

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

Application/Control Number: 09/938,288 Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 5721 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot February 15, 2006 Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732

M. Varget

2/15/06